UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,126	06/21/2006	Jacques Thilly	VB60233	9345
	7590 11/28/200 SPARKMAN, LLP	EXAMINER		
121 SW SALM	· ·	MAUST, TIMOTHY LEWIS		
SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/554,126	THILLY ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Timothy L. Maust	3751			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ju This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2005 is/are:	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r. a) accepted or b) objected	·			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/21/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 14; the phrase "and closure. flow" is grammatically incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings filed on 10/21/05 are informal, since the letters, numbers and lines are not uniform in nature throughout the Figures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Claims 1-6 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Choksi et al. (4058121).

Regarding claims 1, 5, 6 the Choksi et al. reference discloses an apparatus (Figure 1) for introducing a liquid into a pharmaceutical container having a puncturable closure, comprising;

a hollow needle (1) suitable for passing through the closure, the needle comprising a tubular conduit (4) defined by a side wall and having an internal bore (12) for the flow of a fluid along the bore in an flow direction, the conduit terminating externally at a pointed end (19), the bore terminating internally at a closed end (18), at

Page 3

least one orifice (25, 26) through the side wall for the exit of fluid flowing along the bore, the at least one orifice being oriented to direct liquid flowing along the bore in a direction having a component parallel to the flow direction, the conduit having at least one vent groove (27) in its outer surface; means to cause the needle to puncture the closure to the extent that the at least one orifice is within the container (defined by applying pressure to syringe 2 by a user); means to cause the liquid to flow along the bore (defined by plunger 8); means to withdraw the needle from the container (defined by withdrawing syringe 2 by a user).

Regarding claim 2, further comprising means to hold the needle and support the container (defined by wings 20 and 21; the container is support by a hand of a user or a table), and to cause them to move relatively together along the longitudinal axis of the needle.

Regarding claim 3, wherein the container is a vial (defined by vial 5) supported with its closure uppermost, and the needle is held above the container and moved downwardly toward the closure.

Regarding claim 4, inasmuch structure that is defined by a conveyor, a user's arm would meet the claim limitation by conveying the vials from one location to another.

Regarding claims 12-16, the process as claimed would be inherent during use and operation of the device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choksi et al.

Regarding claim 7, the Choksi et al. reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed supra), but doesn't disclose the pointed end of the conduit being a separate plug part. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the pointed end of the Choksi needle a separate plug part, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art.

Nerwin *v. Erlichman*, 150 U.S. 168; USPQ 177, 179.

Regarding claim 8, Choski shows in Figure 3 an internal closed end (18) having surfaces that converge toward an upstream direction (defined by end 13), but doesn't disclose the orifice perimeter surfaces being between 10 and 60 degrees relative to the upstream direction and the total cross sectional area being +/- 20% of the cross sectional bore of the conduit. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ orifice perimeter surfaces between 10 and 60 degrees and have a total cross sectional area being +/- 20%, since it has

been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617F 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 9-11, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited prior art pertains to various needle devices having similar structure to that of the Applicant.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L. Maust whose telephone number is (571) 272-4891. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. 7:00-5:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/554,126 Page 6

Art Unit: 3751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy L Maust/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

11/24/08